

REMARKS

Claim 17 was amended. Claim 21 was canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 15 to 20 and 22 to 28 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this Response.

Claims 15 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,687,800 to Nassor (“Nassor reference”).

The Nassor reference appears to concern a chip card having a processing means and main information storage means. Specifically, the Nassor reference refers to a method for loading and unloading the programmable memory as a function of the need for the programs and/or the applicative data, for an information processing device constituted by a card. The Nassor reference also refers to a method for opening a same application twice simultaneously to speed up time.

In contrast, claim 17 is directed to a method for releasing a data processing unit for processing project data of a project, and requires, among other features, requesting usage permission for using the data processing unit to process project data belonging to a predetermined project, the predetermined project data being cryptographically protected, transmitting the predetermined, cryptographically protected project data via a communication network to a usage-permission generating device, and assigning a client a plurality of value units for the release of the data processing unit for multiple projects, wherein the plurality of value units are devalued in response to a request by the client for a usage right. The claims, including claim 17, concerns a different invention than the Nassor reference. The Nassor reference does not appear to identically disclose using signatures in order to release a data processing unit to process project data belonging to the project once the signature is verified as correct, nor handling a plurality of value units in the same manner, as in claim 17.

Further, independent claims 15 and 22 recite features analogous to those of amended claim 17 and are allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 17. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 15, 17, and 22, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as those claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by the Nassor reference.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that any outstanding rejections of claims 15 to 20 and 22 to 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) have been overcome, and that those claims are allowable as presented above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 16, 2009

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200